



CITY OF KIRKLAND

Department of Public Works

123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3800

www.kirklandwa.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Transportation Commission

From: David Godfrey, P.E., Transportation Engineering Manager

Date: March 23, 2012

Subject: Level of Service/Concurrency/Project selection

Where have we been

Three items from Transportation Conversations that are on the work plan are driving this effort:

1. Develop new level of service standards that align with transportation principles
2. Develop clear goals and prioritization systems for project categories
3. Review and revise concurrency system

We started trying to look at level of service alone. This is when we spent several months thinking about how to measure connections between key locations for various modes of travel. (Figure 1) We set the "LOS only" work aside and looked at Concurrency. We looked at both the Bellingham and Redmond systems. They looked promising, particularly the Redmond system. (Attachment 1)

A key component of the Redmond system is a comprehensive transportation plan that shows all projects that are likely to be funded for the next 20 years. Kirkland has pieces of such a plan, but doesn't have a comprehensive document in one place. To continue examining a possible concurrency system a surrogate transportation plan was developed. (Attachment 2) This was done by looking at funding levels we might expect over the next 10 years –based on the past spending levels—and develop project lists that fit within spending of \$6 million per year or \$60 million over 10 years.

Staff developed prioritized lists for each mode, based on maintenance as a first priority and taking projects from approved plans and projects funded in the CIP. The Commission looked at four models of how to allocate funds across modes: 1) historic funding allocations, 2) Auto oriented 3) Ped/bike oriented and 4) balanced. It was agreed that a balanced approach would be best. The Commission supported a method that described how to allocate funds across modes and maintenance to achieve a balanced allocation (Attachment 3).

Given a project list we looked at the Redmond concurrency method in more detail. The Commission agreed that the method detailed seemed reasonable (Attachment 4). We also agreed on a definition of level of service that is based on the projects that can be reasonably funded and that provide a balanced transportation system.

We then turned to the question of the CIP. 2012 was scheduled to be a "major" CIP year, so there was some urgency to answer these questions, but that has changed. The CIP discussion quickly brought up questions about methods currently used to identify and prioritize projects. Some Commissioners felt uncomfortable with the current methods.

Staff brought back more documentation on the selection and prioritization processes (Attachment 5). These were described within a framework that projects should come from approved plans and those plans have prioritization methods. The plans are based on adopted goals. As funding is available, prioritized lists of projects are completed. Evaluation of the existing system is based on adopted performance measures that come from the original goals. Although a complete system exists for some modes or aspects, for example pavement maintenance, there were several key missing pieces in the city's current methods. One of the larger missing elements was a comprehensive transportation plan, particularly in the area of auto capacity.

Where do we go from here

Of the three original tasks:

1. Develop new level of service standards that align with transportation principles
2. Develop clear goals and prioritization systems for project categories
3. Review and revise concurrency system

We have agreement and a fairly clear plan on items 1 and 3. For item 2, we know what the missing pieces are, but filling in those pieces is not simple. Further, full development of items 1 and 3 require a clear set of projects and completing item 2 is needed to develop that set of projects.

Some options that are not necessarily exclusive of each other:

- Use the project list developed for the concurrency exercise as a placeholder project list and use it to report to Council on the way we'd like to approach items 1 and 3 above.
- Have further discussions on item 2 and how to fill in any missing pieces that might exist, then begin to fill in those pieces, some of which might be fairly simple and others of which may be difficult.
- Start a process to develop a new 20 year transportation Plan. This would likely be tied to a Comprehensive Plan update.

Figure 1 Draft Transit Level of Service

	Downtown						Houghton						Rosehill					
Bridle Trails	Route	Transfer	Distance	Frequenc y	Hours	Quality	Route	Transfer	Distance	Frequenc y	Hours	Quality	Route	Transfer	Distance	Freq uenc y	Hours	Quality
	245	4.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.90	245	4.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.90	245 to/from 248 or 230	2.0	1.0	3.0	4.0	2.25
Rose Hill	Route	Transfer	Distance	Frequenc y	Hours	Quality	Route	Transfer	Distance	Frequenc y	Hours	Quality						
	230,245	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.15	245 to/from 248 or 230	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.55						
Houghton	Route	Transfer	Distance	Frequenc y	Hours	Quality												
	255, 238, 540, 245	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.40												